



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/940,211	08/28/2001	Edward Federowicz		5390

7590  
EDWARD FEDEROWICZ  
98 WEST 32ND STREET  
BAYONNE, NJ 07002

02/05/2008

EXAMINER

SHERR, CRISTINA O

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3621

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

02/05/2008

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

# Office Action Summary

**Application No.**

09/940,211

**Applicant(s)**

FEDEROWICZ, EDWARD

**Examiner**

CRISTINA OWEN SHERR

**Art Unit**

3621

**-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --**  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12 December 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-11 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 1-6 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 7-11 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

### **DETAILED ACTION**

#### **Acknowledgements.**

1. This communication is in response to applicant's amendment filed December 12, 2006. Claims 1-6 have been withdrawn. Claims 7-11 have been added and are currently amended.
2. We note that claims 1-6 were withdrawn unilaterally by Applicant, rather than in response to any requirement for restriction or election of species.
3. With respect to claims 7-11, we note that all of claims 7-11 have been amended in response to a Requirement for Restriction issued on October 4, 2006. The said Restriction Requirement is hereby withdrawn.

#### ***Claim Objections***

4. The withdrawal of claims 1-6 is object to as not being in response to any requirement for restriction or election, but rather having been undertaken unilaterally by Applicant.
5. Claims 9-11 are objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c) as being in improper form because they are each dependent on multiple dependent claims. Specifically, claim 9 is dependent on claims 7 and 8, claim 10 is dependent on claims 7, 8, and 9, and claim 11 is dependent on claims 7, 8, 9, and 10. See MPEP § 608.01(n). Accordingly, claims 9, 10, and 11 have not been further treated on the merits.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112 2nd Paragraph***

6. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

7. Claims 7-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

a. In the instant application, claim 7 is directed to a "method and apparatus". For this reason, we find that claim 7 is a hybrid claim, and is properly rejected, along with its dependent claims 8-11, under section 112, second paragraph. A single claim which claims both an apparatus and the method steps of using the apparatus is indefinite under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph. *IPXL Holdings v. Amazon.com, Inc.*, 430 F.2d 1377, 1384, 77 USPQ2d 1140, 1145 (Fed. Cir. 2005); *Ex parte Lyell*, 17 USPQ2d 1548 (Bd. Pat. App. & Inter. 1990) (claim directed to an automatic transmission workstand and the method of using it held ambiguous and properly rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph).

b. Claims 7-11 are also rejected as indefinite under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, due to the phrase "classified under . . . " at the end of each claim. Such language fails to point and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101***

8. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

9. Claims 7-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. Specifically, independent claim 7, and therefore its dependent claims 8-11, is directed to neither a "process" nor a "machine," but rather embraces or overlaps two different statutory classes of invention set forth in 35 U.S.C. 101 which is drafted so as to set forth the statutory classes of invention in the alternative only. *Ex parte Lyell* at 1551.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

10. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Colbert (US 5,485,510).

11. Regarding claim 7 –

Colbert discloses a method designed to prevent the theft and misuse of a person's identity when one attempts to obtain new credit under a given name by comparing the recorded digitized voice of an applicant to the digitized voice of the

registered applicant, thereby allowing only the registered applicant to obtain credit information. (see, e.g. abs, col 2 ln 15-20, col 3 ln 20-38).

12. Colbert does not specifically disclose recording the digitized of the applicant. However, it would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, that in when "the caller is identified using voice recognition" (col 1 ln 49-51), that somewhere, and somehow the voice of the caller must be compared to a recording on file.

13. Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Colbert (US 5,485,510) in view of Erickson (US 5,765,152).

14. Regarding claim 8 –

Colbert discloses as discussed above . Colbert does not disclose the limitation of having the method of claim 7 implemented via a website. Erickson, however, does disclose the use of a website for managing/selling digital and other rights. It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Colbert and Erickson motivated by the need for security in the protection from identity theft while making use of the ease of buying and selling through the internet.

### ***Response to Arguments***

15. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-6 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

***Conclusion***

16. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP

§ 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 C.F.R. §1.136(a).

17. A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

18. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to CRISTINA OWEN SHERR whose telephone number is (571)272-6711. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30-5:00 Monday through Friday.

19. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Andrew J. Fischer can be reached on (571)272-6779. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 3621

20. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Cristina Owen Sherr  
Patent Examiner, AU 3621

/ANDREW J. FISCHER/  
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3621